



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

A THIRTEENTH-CENTURY HEBREW-FRENCH
GLOSSARY.

Glossaire hébreu-français du xiii^e siècle. Recueil de mots hébreux bibliques avec traduction française. Manuscrit de la Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds hébreu, n^o. 302. Publié sous les auspices de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, par MAYER LAMBERT et LOUIS BRANDIN.—Paris, Ernest Leroux, Éditeur (28, Rue Bonaparte, vi^e), 1905. Pp. xv and 294. 4^o.

THE MS. on which this publication is based was designated by Arsène Darmesteter as the most considerable and interesting of the Hebrew-French glossaries. Of such MSS. there are, as the same scholar established, in all nine, which are spread over the libraries of Paris, Basel, Parma, Leipzig, Oxford, and Turin (see *Revue des Études Juives*, XLII, 59). They follow the text of the Hebrew bible in the order of the Biblical books; they give the French equivalent of single words, and form the richest source for the knowledge of Old French. Their importance is especially due to the fact that they emanate from a period which has left but a small number of French writings. At the same time, they present the French words in Hebrew transcription with, for the most part, careful indication of the vowel-points, so that we obtain a firm grasp of the method of enunciation. As sources for the history of the French language these glossaries connect themselves with Rashi's Bible commentaries, but the former naturally include a much larger mass of words than do the latter. The wealth of material now made accessible to critical investigation by the important work of MM. Lambert and Brandin may be seen from the enumeration that the 213 pages of the main part of the work contain on an average ninety-six glosses each. There are thus in all not much less than 20,000 French words, and even allowing for the frequent repetitions, the volume provides a very considerable number of words and word-forms.

In the Introduction, the editors describe the work, the publication of which they had undertaken. As to the contents of the MS., they

quote the account given by Arsène Darmesteter in *Romania*, I, pp. 146-76. This account was, however, defective, for it makes the Glossary close with Ezra and Nehemiah, and makes no mention of Chronicles, with which in fact the MS. concludes. Noteworthy is the order of the Biblical books in the Glossary. After the Pentateuch follow the Five Scrolls, just as in several of the oldest editions of the Hebrew Bible (see Ginsburg, *Introduction*, p. 4); these Scrolls are given in the order of their liturgical use, beginning, however, with Koheleth—the first Scroll read after the New Year Festival. For this modification in the order of the Scrolls Ginsburg cites no parallel. The Prophetical Books stand in the order assigned in the Baraitha, *Baba Bathra*, 14 b; thus Jeremiah precedes and Isaiah succeeds Ezekiel. First among the Hagiographa comes Job—here again Ginsburg's tables (*ibid.*, p. 7) offer no parallel. The note in which the compiler of the work is named occurs in the middle of the MS., at the close of the Prophetical Books. The editors infer from this that the Prophets originally stood at the end, and that the present arrangement of the MS. is due to the binder.

The author of the Glossary describes himself in the note just alluded to as Joseph, son of the holy (i.e. the martyr) R. Simson. He completed "these *Le'azim* on the twenty-four books" (לעזים אלו מן) (עשרים וארבעה ספרים) in Kislev, 5001 (i.e. November-December, 1240). The editors suggest the identification of the martyr Simson with a Jew of that name burnt at Bray in 1191. As regards the linguistic character of the glosses, Darmesteter pronounced it Burgundian. The editors devote a whole chapter (pp. ix-xv) to the question of the dialect, and, as a result of penetrating examination—rendered difficult by the composite character of the sources of the Glossary—express the conclusion (p. xii): the dialect of the writer is a mixture of the dialects of Lorraine, Champagne, and (Burgundian) Franche-Comté. He must, therefore, have belonged to one of these departments. Certain linguistic phenomena lead the editors to pronounce in favour of the Haute-Saône.

The editors of Joseph b. Simson's glosses have omitted all such portions of the MS. as go beyond the French equivalents of the Biblical expressions. In the MS. the Hebrew words are sometimes explained by short notes. Such notes are especially frequent in the Prophets and Hagiographa (p. iii); here and there authorities are cited; besides the French exegetes of the eleventh and twelfth centuries and the Gaon Saadya, the MS. quotes Spanish authors, Menachem, Dunash, Ibn Ezra, and Parchon (p. ii). It is a pity that these notes and citations were not partially at least reproduced in an appendix. But the editors have kept strictly to their design of

treating the French glosses of Joseph b. Simson as a contribution to the history of the French language. And since they make their appeal in the first instance to romance philologists, they print the glosses in French and not in Hebrew characters. The onerous task of transcribing the glosses from the Hebrew script was relieved by the systematic precision with which the writer had transcribed the French consonants and vowels into the corresponding Hebrew. On the subject of this "Transcription" the Introduction (pp. v-ix) supplies clear information. The editors felt compelled to withhold the original Hebrew forms of the glosses so as to keep the size of the volume within reasonable limits. This method of reproduction appreciably reduces the utility of the edition for the study of other glosses of the kind, for the Hebrew form of the French words is not always recognizable with ease in their French transcription. Yet this is an insignificant drawback in relation to the very remarkable help which the work of MM. Lambert and Brandin provides for the study of North-French Biblical exegesis. We are now in possession of a repertory of the French words which served for the explanation of the Biblical text, and this repertory must include the larger part of all such words used elsewhere for the same end. The following figures show in what numerical relation the glosses of Rashi stand to the present Glossary. In his recently published brochure (*Die altfranzösischen Ausdrücke im Pentateuch-Commentar Raschi's*, Frankfurt a. M., 1905), Dr. A. Berliner explains in alphabetical sequence about 250 words. The glosses to the Pentateuch in the present volume number about twenty times as many (they exceed 4,800). The French words common to Rashi and Joseph b. Simson on Genesis have already been collected by Professor Brandin (*Revue des Études Juives*, XLII, 52 f.). The list of parallels cited here (p. ix) consists of fifty words; but the number of glosses on Genesis in Joseph b. Simson exceeds 1,500. In Exodus Rashi uses over forty, in Leviticus over twenty, in Numbers eighteen, in Deuteronomy fourteen words (in all about 150), which are also to be found in Joseph b. Simson. In Rashi's Commentary to the Pentateuch there are thus about 100 words which are not included in the present Glossary. From the preceding facts it is obvious that Rashi's *lo'azim* contributed only in a comparative small mass to the material of the Glossary, and that we must regard the glossaries as a particular branch of the literature of the French school, which arose side by side with the commentaries written in Hebrew and aimed at directing the translation of the Bible into the vernacular.

Now that we for the first time possess such a Glossary to the whole Bible, the thought forces itself upon us that the Glossary is at

bottom nothing other than the abbreviated transcript of a translation of the Bible used for educational purposes, though only orally transmitted. The Glossary is, in a certain sense, the skeleton of a French translation, such as grew up among the French-speaking Jews for use in the education of the young. It was only because such translations were of exclusively *didactic* use, pointing to no need of a vernacular rendering for liturgical or literary purposes, that the written fixation of the whole translation was omitted. At all events, no traces or remains of such a complete version have so far come to light. On the other hand, there arose works, such as the Glossary which is here for the first time made accessible to us, which served as helps for teaching the Bible. That these glossaries arose from oral translation is proved not only by their *form*, which points to a close association with the Biblical text, but also by their *contents*. For we do not find here—what we should expect in a merely lexicographical work—the meaning of a word without regard to its inflection, but we do find an exact translation of every form precisely as it occurs in the text. The procedure is thus the same as in the case of interlinear translations, except that here not every single word of the text is rendered, the translation being limited to such words as present some lexicographical, grammatical, or exegetical interest with the exclusion of those parts of the text which offer no such interest or present no difficulty. We can, therefore, regard the Glossary before us as an abbreviated interlineary translation of the Bible. Naturally, divergent views made themselves felt in an orally transmissive French rendering, and this Glossary gives a number of instances in which the same word is translated in varying ways. Thus in the Book of Job there are more than twenty double translations. Admittedly, Joseph b. Simson had older glossaries before him which he used as sources. The varying translation of single words he introduces (p. iii) with the expressions: *יש אומר*, *לשון אחר*, *דבר אחר*, *אז נמי* or even *יש ולעז (= ויש לעז)*. That he did not include in his Glossary all variants is inferable from what has been already said above as to the relation between this Glossary and Rashi's Commentary. From the French words in Samuel b. Meir's Commentary to the Pentateuch Joseph b. Simson has not derived a single one (with perhaps the exception of Exod. v. 9 *ישעו*). In his rendering of Deut. xxviii. 68 may be seen an instructive instance of our glossator's adoption of a rendering expressly rejected by Rashi: *והתמכרתם בלעז אי פורוונדיין ווש* (i. e. et porvondrez vous) *ולא יתכן*. *לפרש והתמכרתם בלשון ונמכרתם על ידי מוכרים אחרים*. Our Glossary nevertheless provides *והתמכרתם* with the rendering, "*é serez porvonduz* (Ye will be sold)," i. e. precisely the passive sense rejected by

Rashi. This was apparently a traditional translation which not even Rashi's expression of opinion could drive out of circulation. In this instance Rashi undoubtedly designed his note in opposition to a current translation.

As a characteristic of this work, the editors adduce (p. iv) the circumstance that the Hebrew texts are often inexactly written: "Il commet aussi des étourderies en écrivant inexactement les mots hébreux, par exemple ויתהלך (Gen. iii. 8) pour מתהלך, traduit logiquement par *porala* au lieu de *poralont*." But a closer examination of such divergences from the text shows that they are not always due to the glossator's carelessness. It appears rather that instead of the actual word in the text an analogous Biblical word is cited and translated. This is the case with the instance ויתהלך (Gen. v. 22) for מתהלך cited by the editors. Other examples are: Exod. xxiii. 29 (for יְהִישָׁב (והשב from Deut. vii. 22; Lev. xxvii. 18 (for יְהִישָׁב (והשב from Lev. xxv. 31; 1 Sam. xv. 28 (for ויתמהמה (מתמהמה from Gen. xix. 16; 1 Kings xviii. 13 (for ויתחבא (ואחביא from Gen. iii. 8; Jer. xvi. 9 (for והשבתי (הנני משבית) from Jer. vii. 34; ib. xxxix. 6 (for חוריה (חורי from Isa. xxxiv. 12; Isa. xxix. 20 (for שוקד אני (שוקד from Jer. i. 12; ib. l. 11 (for קרחה (קרחי from Deut. xxxiii. 22; Hag. i. 4 (for תעשיקו (תעשק from Jer. xxii. 14; Job x. 3 (for תעשיקו (תעשוק) from Zech. vii. 10; ib. xx. 28 (for מוגרים (נגרים from Mic. i. 4; Ps. lxxviii. 31 (for התרפס (מתרפס from Prov. vi. 3; ib. cxxxix. 3 (for הסכנתה (הסכנתי from Num. xxii. 30. In these passages another word is cited and translated from another text explanatory of the text in hand, and it is possible that the glossator by oversight omitted, in reproducing what lay before him, the citation and translation of the word actually concerned. But it is equally probable that the glossator did this in the instances given (and others which I have not adduced) by design rather than by oversight. In one case, the editors have rightly perceived this, viz. in 1 Sam. ii. 4, where אורו is not translated by the glossator, but in place of it ותאורני (Psalm xviii. 40) is cited and translated. This gloss to the omitted אורו the editors place, with the Biblical reference, in brackets. They should have followed the same course with the other passages which I have adduced. Once, the glossator replaces the text by a word of post-Biblical origin. This occurs on Jer. xxxiii. 6, where for עתרת we have עתירתי (taken from the liturgy). But often enough the glossator cites the text in variants to the common text, which variants are known to us also from other evidence. Thus, Song of Songs i. 17 (for ברושים (ברותים; Judges v. 16 (for לפלגות (בפלגות; Jer. xxxiii. 3 (for ונצורות as well as ובצורות (both cited and translated); Hos. x. 10 (for באותי (באותי; Job xvii. 1 (for נדעכו (נעכו);

ib. xxvii. 6 (for אֶרְפָּה) אֶרְפָּה (= אֶרְפָּה without suffix); Prov. xx. 2 (for מַתְעֵבְרוּ) מַתְעֵבְרוּ; ib. xxiii. 20 (for כְּסוּבָאִי and בּוֹלְלִי) כְּסוּבָאִי and בּוֹלְלִי; ib. xxiii. 28 (for בַּחֲתָף) בַּחֲתָף; Dan. viii. 8 (for וּבְעֵצְמוֹ) וּבְעֵצְמוֹ. Besides such variants, which occur in other sources, there are some which are merely due to the inattention of the copyist or author, and have no influence on the translation (e.g. Prov. iii. 18 for מֵאוֹשֶׁר the reading is מִיֹּשֶׁר, but the Massoretic reading is translated). But there are others which, though we have no other evidence for their occurrence, are undoubtedly to be regarded as variants to the received text. Thus, in Neh. ii. 13 (for שֹׁכֵר) שֹׁכֵר the glossator cites שֹׁכֵר, rendering it "étupont"; and this is the same French verb which is often used in the Glossary in the sense "to close," "shut up," as e.g. in the rendering of וַיִּסְכְּרוּ (Gen. viii. 2) where the editors transcribe "é furt étouffées," but where we should probably read "étupées." In 2 Chron. xx. 37 (for עֲצָרוֹ) we have עֲצָמוֹ, which is rendered by the same verb as is used in translating וַיַּעֲצֵמוֹ in Exod. i. 7. In Gen. xli. 24 (for הִדְקוֹת) we have הִדְקוֹת (cf. ver. 27); 2 Sam. xvii. 13 (for עַד הַנַּחֵל) עַד הַנַּחֵל; 1 Kings iii. 11 (for הַכֵּין) הַכֵּין (translated as the verb הִכֵּין elsewhere); Isa. xxxiv. 13 (for תַּנִּין) תַּנִּין ("dragon"); Zech. xi. 5 (for יַהֲרוּגוֹ) יַהֲרוּגוֹ; Ps. xlix. 6 (for יִסְבְּנוּ) יִסְבְּנוּ, plural; Dan. ii. 34 (for הַתְּנוּרָה) הַתְּנוּרָה, translated as a passive. In Est. i. 6 instead of the single word כֶּרֶס, the two syllables are written and translated as separate words פֶּר "kuysin," pillow, and פֶּס "fayle," which, however, must be amended into "payle"—the same word which is used in rendering פֶּסִיס in Gen. xxxvii. 3, and which, according to the index (p. 273), signifies "étoffe de laine?". A "Notaricon" significance obviously underlies this separation of the word.

For the history of the Jewish exegesis of the Bible, as well as for the history of Hebrew lexicography, these products of the North-French school supply an unusually valuable source. The work deserves further investigation from this point of view. At all events, we can deduce what apprehension of the Biblical text and what interpretations of its words obtained currency. The editors note that the glosses sometimes point to the influence of the Midrashic exegesis, as, for instance, in Lev. iv. 22, where (as in Rashi ad loc.) אִשֶּׁר is translated in the sense of אִשְׁרִי ("benuré"). I content myself here with some details from the glosses to Job which throw light on the exegetic principles of the glossator or on his methods of translation. Job i. 1 אִישׁ "baron" (so Gen. ix. 20). Elsewhere this word is the rendering of שְׁלִישׁ (Exod. xiv. 7; Ezek. xxiii. 23; 1 Chron. xii. 18).—i. 3 עֲבוּרָה ("goynerie") is translated by the same word as (Gen. xii. 5, etc.) is used for רִכּוּשׁ, i. e. "property." In Gen. xxvi. 14 the rendering of

עבודה is different. — i. 6 השטן = "lu nuyzor," *the injurer*. Also elsewhere שטן (verb or noun) is rendered "injure"; so Num. xxii. 22 ("a nuyre"), Ezra iv. 6. — iii. 1 ויען "é hucha" ("cry," "speak aloud"); the same word serves to translate ותען (Exod. xv. 21), ענהו (1 Sam. ix. 17), ויען (2 Kings i. 12), and is used for ענה and its derivatives when the meaning "answer" is inappropriate. — iii. 5 מרירי is rendered by the similarly sounding "miriéne" (= *mérienne*); the "noon-demon" is intended (see Rashi ad loc.). — v. 7 רשף "charbon" ("coal"); so in Hab. iii. 5. — v. 21 שוט ("an zérchemont") is rendered by the same French as is used for חקר (Job xi. 7), as also in ix. 23; thus taking it from שוט ("wander about," "examine"). — ix. 10 מספר = "retréymont" ("narrative," "report"). — xii. 19 כהנים = "mérs" ("princes," following Rashi). — xv. 34 חֲנִיף = "felon"; so also to xx. 5 and xxxiv. 30. Elsewhere the same word in Job (viii. 13, xiii. 16) is rendered by "lozonjore" ("perverse"), as also Isa. ix. 16; Ps. xxxv. 16; on the other hand, נבל (Ps. xiv. 1, liii. 1) = "felon," and "felonies" serves as the translation of זרים (Ps. xix. 4) and of הזרונים (Ps. cxxiv. 5). — xvi. 3 הֶקֶץ = "avéylér" ("awake"); thus the glossator read it תִּבְּנוּ "teyzéz" ("be silent"), on the basis of Rashi's explanation (תִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ לַהֲבִין). — xxii. 14 חוג = "konpas" ("circle"); so in Isa. xl. 22; Prov. viii. 27; Job xxvi. 10. The same French is used for מענל (Prov. ii. 9; Isa. xxvi. 7). — xxviii. 6, 16 ספיר = "kristayl." The same word renders הברלח (Gen. ii. 22; Num. xi. 17). In Exod. xxiv. 10 ספיר = "sapir." — xxviii. 18 פנינים = "or"; but "or" is probably here to be referred to כתם, which word would then have a double translation.

As regards the linguistic character of the glosses, the editors point out (p. xi, n. 2) that very few foreign (non-French) words are used. Equally rare are the Hebrew expressions used in translating: I refer to such expressions as had been adopted into the speech of the Jews of France as current equivalents for the Biblical words. Thus, e. g., "tefilin" (Exod. xiii. 16; Deut. vi. 8) for טוטפות (see Onkelos); מערב as translation of הים (Ezek. xlii. 19 ("le ongle de ma'arab")); זרים for יָמִין (Ps. lxxxix. 13). The editors (loc. cit.) also refer to "bezim," but do not give the reference. This extremely small number of non-French elements in the glosses demonstrates the degree of purity with which the Jews of France, in that period of spiritual activity, used the mother tongue, and employed it in translating the Scriptures. (It is worth noting that in translating עֲרֵה the word "senagogue," *synagogue*, is twice used, Num. xv. 26 and Ps. lxxxii. 1; in the latter verse the Vulgate also has "synagoga.")

The great service rendered by MM. Lambert and Brandin in

investigating and editing the glosses of Joseph b. Simson is increased by the very complete index which they have appended. This index (pp. 225-90) is a dictionary in which the glosses are translated into modern French. It is an indispensable help for the use and study of the glosses by those who are not familiar with Old French. Preceding the index is a critical apparatus to the Glossary: "Leçons du manuscrit et corrections diverses (pp. 215-24). The whole is completed by a "Tableau de concordance entre le manuscrit et l'imprimé" (p. 291 f.), and a list of "Errata" (p. 293 f.). The latter would have been increased by further revision, for despite the great care which has been exercised in the edition there are not wanting more or less important misprints, only a part of which are corrected in the "Errata." In the section on Job (pp. 148-66) I have noted the following misprints: p. 150, 40, for חמין read תאמין; 154, 1, for פתרו read פתח; ib. 40, for כפן read כפך; ib. 91, for כברו read יכברו; 156, 39, "on sé[n]ors" is given as the translation of ברי (Job xvii. 16). Perhaps we should read "onseyne" which is used to render ארת (Gen. xxi. 11; Exod. xviii. 8; Num. xii. 1). In the index I have not found this "sé[n]ors."—156, 82 is wrongly repeated in number 84; ib. 89, for בין read נין; 159, 34, for רפאים read פראאים.—A few other corrections are: p. x, l. 6, for Gen. xv. 12 read xv. 2; line 7, before 28 supply xix; p. 18, 38, "ionke" (= yonc), the rendering of גומא (Exod. ii. 3), does not appear in the index under *i*, but under *y*.—P. 29, 20, "réynemont" (= משפט Exod. xxviii. 15) is missing from the index.—P. 35, 27, the note of exclamation after פרהת is superfluous.—P. 38, 64, add the number of the verse (25).—P. 41, 48, for vii read viii.—P. 45, 48, for xxxii read xxxiii.—P. 48, 77, before 18 supply v.—P. 54, 59-66, the chapters and verses are altogether omitted.—P. 68, 18, for xxii read xviii.—P. 70, 76, the note of exclamation is superfluous.—P. 121, 48, for xxxix read xl.

The book is produced, so far as externals are concerned, in a splendid style, which is worthy of a work in which the editors have rendered conspicuous service to two branches of study, romance philology and mediaeval Jewish literary history. The writers may be sure of the lively gratitude of students of both these branches.

W. BACHER.

Budapest.